DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 056 644 HE 002 643

AUTHOR Norman, Ralph D.
TITLE A Study of Some Attitudes towards the Doctor of Arts Degree in the Southwest.
INSTITUTION New Mexico Univ., Albuquerque.
PUB DATE Sep 71
NOTE 51p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Personnel; Administrator Attitudes; *Attitudes; College Teachers; *Degrees (Titles); *Doctoral Degrees; Faculty; *Higher Education; Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

To ascertain interest in and need for the Doctor of Arts (DA) degree in Southwestern institutions of higher education, a questionnaire was sent to the presidents of all accredited institutions, as well as recognized candidates for accreditation in New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Colorado, Wyoming, and Texas. In addition to the questionnarie, the presidents received a 3 page enclosure with information on the D.A. degree. Of the 181 institutions contacted, 151, or 80.7 percent returned useable replies. The majority of the responses were favorable to questions concerning approval of the degree; willingness to hire, pay, and promote D.A. holders on an equal basis with Ph.D.'s; allowing D.A.'s to teach all disciplines at all 4 undergraduate-year levels; adequacy of preparation for undergraduate teaching; and administrator-perceived prestige. Four out of 5 respondents felt that the Ph.D. dissertation was not a sine qua non for undergraduate teaching. Only in faculty-perceived prestige did the D.A. fall considerably below the Ph.D. Among the levels of institutions, the doctoral institutions were least favorable and the 2-year colleges most favorable in their attitudes toward the D.A. (AF)

EDO 56644

A STUDY OF SOME ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE DOCTOR OF ARTS DEGREE IN THE SOUTHWEST

Ralph D. Norman

Associate Dean of
Arts and Sciences and
Professor of Psychology

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO

September, 1971

HE002643

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A STUDY OF SOME ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE DOCTOR OF ARTS DEGREE IN THE SOUTHWEST[1]

Ralph D. Norman[2]

The University of New Mexico

Considerable attention has been devoted in recent years to the Doctor of Arts degree. In its basic conceptualization, it has been stressed as a degree aimed at preparation of individuals for undergraduate teaching, although there is at least one prestigious graduate school considering it as a degree for other sorts of professional assignments. The college teaching thrust has been emphasized and endorsed in official statements of the Council of Graduate Schools (CGS) and of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU). The D.A. has also been espoused by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. A pioneer institution, Carnegie-Mellon University, established the degree in 1967 and has already awarded it in a number of fields. Carnegie Corporation grants have been given to ten other universities for D.A. programs to begin in the fall of 1971. Interest in the degree has been so great that the Carnegie and Johnson Foundations supported a conference on it held at the Johnson Foundation at Wingspread (Racine, Wisconsin) under the sponsorship of the CGS in October, 1970, a report on which was released in spring, 1971 (Eastman, 1970a).

Previous reports on attitudes towards the D.A. are quite limited. Anderson (1970), at Wingspread, gave an account of a telephone poll of presidents of eight various degree-level institutions in Iowa, among whom reactions were quite mixed. He also reported a study done by Eckley, of Drake University, which was limited to 18 two-year and 26 four-year colleges in seven midwestern states. These 44 institutions were 65% of an original sample of 68 polled with a very short questionnaire. Examination of his questionnaire (Eckley, personal communication, 1971) revealed only four useable questions, two bearing some resemblance to ones used in this study. Also, there was no statistical analysis of his data. Pittman (1970) gave an impressionistic account of attitudes about the D.A. of administrators of Black institutions, the tenor of which was one of optimism mixed with caution because of the special needs of Black students.

The author, requested to study carefully the whole matter of the D.A. for its eventual consideration for adoption at his own institution,

---

[1]Special appreciation is due Dr. Chester C. Travelstead, Vice President for Academic Affairs, University of New Mexico, for provision of funds to support this research.

[2]Professor of Psychology and Associate Dean, College of Arts and Sciences, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico, 87106. This study is to be submitted for publication. Reproduction in whole or in part is prohibited without special permission of the author.

presents here a comprehensive study of attitudes towards the degree. While it was done only among institutions in the Southwest, it is felt that it has broad applicability to other areas of the country as well.[3]

METHOD

Because it was desired to ascertain interest in and need for the D.A. in institutions located in and around New Mexico, a questionnaire was sent to all accredited higher education institutions in the states of New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Colorado, Oklahoma, Wyoming and Texas. Included were those fully accredited as well as recognized candidates for accreditation. To insure as many replies as possible, the author followed findings about which he had written in a paper on mail questionnaires (Norman, 1948). The first questionnaire wave was sent out on December 7, 1970 and the follow-up wave on January 21, 1971.

The procedure followed was to send each potential respondent institution's president three documents. One was an individually typed letter (Appendix A); a short three-page enclosure (Appendix B); and a brief questionnaire on attitudes towards the degree (Appendix C). Appendix B was compiled as a result of thorough reading of the available literature concerning the Doctor of Arts, both pro and con, and other relevant materials on problems of college undergraduate teaching. It was written in its present form because, over and over again in this literature--and, as it turned out later, throughout the Wingspread discussions--there ran the threads of the rationale for the D.A. and the utterly inevitable comparisons with the Ph.D., particularly that concerning the nature of the dissertation. Especially helpful in drafting the enclosure were the papers by Cardozier (1968) and Wortham (1967) and a set of guidelines for D.A. programs by Dunham (1970a). Appendix B, it was felt, would be helpful particularly to individuals in smaller institutions or more isolated situations who had heard or read little about the degree. It is granted here that it may have had some biasing effect on the results of this study, but against this was weighed the risks of numbers of invalid returns based on ignorance by the more conscientious or, what was equally bad, no return whatsoever from the more honest or perhaps annoyed recipients. Both it and the questionnaire were deliberately kept short to encourage attention and reply. The questionnaire also had a box (see Item 13 of Appendix C) inviting the respondent to receive more information when he returned the questionnaire. This reinforcement for returning the questionnaire is listed as numbers (4) and (5) below. It went out with a cover letter of thanks, explaining to the respondent that he had now a five-part package. This package was (1) Basic Rationale for the Degree, (2) Differences in Preparation Between the D.A. and Ph.D., (3) Nature of the Thesis Requirement for the D.A., all given in Appendix B, as well as (4) Some Arguments in Favor of the Doctor of Arts, and (5) Some Questions Raised by the D.A. and Some Possible Answers.[4]

---

[3]The author attended the Wingspread Conference as a delegate. However, even before then the major design of this study was conceived, and Appendix B was in fact distributed at the Conference. Data were gathered before publication of Conference proceedings.

[4]Parts (4) and (5) are available upon request from the author for a small charge to cover reproduction and mailing costs.

RESULTS

Of 187 institutions contacted, useable replies were received from 151, or 80.7% of the total. This percentage of reply is very high for only two questionnaire waves (Norman, 1948). Table 1 presents a complete analysis of the respondents by state, source of support, i.e., public or private, and level of degree granted.

Table 1 reveals that, geographically, about half of the respondent institutions were located in Texas, and the other half in the remaining six states. The percentages in each state of the total number of institutions originally contacted were: Arizona, 6.4; Colorado, 12.3; New Mexico, 5.9; Oklahoma, 14.3; Texas, 52.9; Utah, 5.9; Wyoming, 2.1. These percentages are very close to those in Table 1. A chi-square test of the divergence of the obtained number of returns from the same relative proportions expected from the original list, categorized geographically, gave $X^2 = 1.28$, statistically insignificant for 6 degrees of freedom (df)[5].

About two-fifths of the respondents were from junior colleges, according to Table 1, and roughly one-fifth each from each of the other three levels of institutions. Public institutions predominated over private by a ratio of two to one among all respondents. Within each of the categories of degree levels, there was also a predominance of public over private schools, except for the four-year colleges. This latter situation is undoubtedly not confined to the Southwest, since exclusively bachelor's degree-granting public colleges are rapidly disappearing off the educational scene. The doctor's degree institutions included two small institutions giving a doctorate in theology. While not officially accredited as "doctor's degree-granting" schools, it was felt that their presence among the 32 doctorate schools would not distort results significantly, and they were allowed to remain in that category. A test of the divergence of the obtained number of returns from the same relative proportions expected from the original group, categorized by degree level and whether public or private, yielded $X^2 = 0.61$, statistically insignificant for 7 df. Thus, it may be said with a great degree of certainty that the respondents differed insignificantly in makeup from those originally contacted, whether examined geographically, by highest degree level, or by source of support.

Table 2 presents data on the total number of students involved in 150 institutions surveyed (one institution gave no data on enrollment). Of these 150 schools, nine gave no numbers of students, but only Full-time Equivalents (FTE's). Also, 16 schools gave FTE's but no numbers of students. Using the mean N:FTE ratio of each particular grouping (e.g., doctoral public, master's private, etc.) the missing numbers were estimated. These estimates probably introduced some distortions in the data but it is believed that these

---

[5]All X^2 tests were conservatively performed with raw N's with efforts to obtain expected cell frequencies greater than 5 wherever possible, and the correction for discontinuity applied in 2 x 2 tables. The number of degrees of freedom are determined by (c-1) (r-1), where c = number of columns and r = number of rows (Edwards, 1967). See also footnote 6 for a brief discussion of statistical significance.

Table 1 - Geographical Distribution of Respondents by Levels of Highest Degree and Source of Support

	Doctor's		Master's		Bachelor's		Associate		Totals			
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private	All	Per Cent
Arizona	3	-	-	-	1	1	7	-	11	1	12	7.9
Colorado	4	1	2	1	4	2	4	-	14	4	18	11.9
New Mexico	3	-	2	1	-	2	2	-	7	3	10	6.6
Oklahoma	1	2	5	1	2	3	6	3	14	9	23	15.2
Texas	10	5	8	6	1	16	26	3	45	30	75	49.7
Utah	1	1	-	-	1	1	5	-	7	2	9	6.0
Wyoming	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	3	1	4	2.6
Total	23	9	17	9	9	25	52	7	101	50	151	99.9
Per Cent	15.2	6.0	11.3	6.0	6.0	16.6	34.4	4.6	66.9	33.1		
Combined N	32		26		34		59		151			
Combined %	21.2		17.2		22.5		39.1		100.0			

Table 2 - Numbers of Students and FTE's in Respondent Institutions

	Students			Full-Time Equivalents			N/FTE
	N	Mean	Range	N	Mean	Range	Ratio
Doctor's	(52.2%)			(54.4%)			
Public(23)	331,147	14,398	850-39,000	275,349	11,972	708-32,500	1.20:1
Private(9)	67,971	7,552	464-25,021	61,821	6,869	430-24,500	1.10:1
Both(32)	399,118	12,472	464-39,000	337,170	10,536	430-32,500	1.18:1
Master's-Specialist's	(13.9%)			(14.7%)			
Public(16)	88,173	5,511	2,476-11,484	76,625	4,789	2,264-9,412	1.15:1
Private(9)	17,811	1,979	270- 4,200	14,830	1,648	270-3,407	1.20:1
Both(25)	105,984	4,239	270-11,484	91,455	3,658	270-9,412	1.16:1
Bachelor's	(8.3%)			(9.0%)			
Public(9)	37,669	4,185	851-11,000	32,979	3,664	720-9,500	1.14:1
Private(25)	25,702	1,028	169- 2,000	22,878	915	169-1,615	1.12:1
Both(34)	63,371	1,864	169-11,000	55,857	1,643	169-9,500	1.13:1
Associate*	(25.6%)			(21.9%)			
Public(52)	185,278	3,563	392-28,650**	127,698	2,456	270-18,250**	1.45:1
Private(7)	10,831	1,547	326- 4,483	8,152	1,165	311-3,144	1.33:1
Both(59)	196,109	3,324	326-28,650**	135,850	2,303	270-18,250**	1.44:1
Totals	(100.0%)			(100.0%)			
Public(100)	642,267	6,423	392-28,650**	512,651	5,127	270-32,500	1.25:1
Private(50)	122,315	2,446	169-25,021	107,681	2,154	169-24,500	1.14:1
Both(150)	764,582	5,097	169-28,650**	620,332	4,136	169-32,500	1.23:1

*Includes one 4-year general purpose institution granting A. A. degree only.
**This figure is one large metropolitan junior college district.

were not serious, since only one-sixth of the institutions were so treated. It is reasonably certain that the respondent institutions enrolled approximately three-quarters of a million students and over 600,000 FTE's. Over half of these were enrolled in the doctoral institutions, the largest of which, public or private, have the status of "multiversities," the former with close to 40,000 students, and the latter with over 25,000. One-quarter of the students in the respondent institutions were in the junior colleges. A matter of special interest to the present study is the ratio of N:FTE in the various institutions. The junior colleges had the greatest discrepancy between numbers and full-time equivalents, and in the public institutions among them, this almost reached a ratio of one and a half to one. Thus, they must have many part-time students, the educational needs or goals of which may be quite different from those of students in other level institutions (Wortham, 1967). The possibility of different teaching strategies for these students must be acknowledged.

A few words need to be said here about the respondents themselves. Although the questionnaire materials were addressed to university presidents, they were not uniformly answered by the latter. Only about one-third (31.3%) of the doctorate-granting schools yielded presidents as respondents, but the lower level schools had respondent presidents as follows: master's, 57.7%; bachelor's, 55.9%; and associate, 52.5%. A chi-square test between two levels of respondents, presidents vs. any lesser individuals, among the different institutions yielded $X^2 = 5.75$, statistically insignificant for 3 df. Thus there were probably little, if any, of the differences reported later on among institutions which could be attributed to the sorts of individuals replying to the questionnaire.

Turning now to the questionnaire itself, the remainder of this section on results will discuss the data obtained from the first ten questions, all involving attitudes towards the D.A. degree itself. These questions were framed on the basis of what was deemed some of the most critical questions related to the degree. Again, it should be stressed that Appendix B accompanied the questionnaire.

Before discussion of the questions themselves, however, one problem immediately posed itself. Would there be any important differences in attitudes between public and private institutions? This question arose mostly because of the financial stringencies many institutions face today. This is especially true of ones dependent on tuition and private resources, and perhaps thus more pinched for funds than public schools. Many of the private colleges in this survey had strong church affiliations and were dependent on church support. If the D.A. were perceived as somehow a "lesser" degree, and D.A.'s could be "bought" more cheaply than Ph.D.'s, would this affect attitudes of private schools differently from public? A list of 40 separate possible statistical tests (four levels of institutions times ten questions) were assigned numbers, and, by means of a table of random numbers, one-third or 13 were randomly selected. None of these 13 revealed statistically significant differences between attitudes of private and public institutions. The data from both private and public institutions were therefore combined.

Question 1: Do you approve of the D.A. degree? This question was asked simply to ascertain whether, in view of many of the pros and cons concerning the D.A. which had been voiced in educational circles, the respondent simply approved, disapproved or could not register an opinion either way about the degree. Since only nine or 6.0% of all respondents answered D.K., this latter category was combined with the negatives to eliminate small cell sizes in both groups. Table 3 presents results from this question.

Table 3 reveals that a large majority (80.1%) of all respondents approve of the D.A., but this approval is by no means uniform. A test of the differences among the institutions gave $X^2 = 14.82$, $p < .01$, 3 df.[6] Least approval (59.4%) was registered among the doctor's degree institutions and greatest approval (89.8%) was registered among A.A. institutions. Surprisingly, the four-year colleges were somewhat behind the master's[7] institutions in level of approval. (This situation will be noticed again in a number of later questions and commented upon in the discussion section.)

Since the D.A. is constantly referred to as an undergraduate teaching degree, a separate chi-square analysis was done between the four-year and two-year institutions. This latter X^2 was 1.17, which was statistically insignificant for 1 df, indicating that the attitudes of the baccalaureate and associate degree institutions did not differ appreciably when it came to unqualified approval (i.e., a dichotomous "Yes" vs. "Non-Yes" answer). Apparently, the highly significant X^2 for the table as a whole was due to the sharp differences in attitude between doctoral institutions and those offering less than the doctorate. For example, there was a statistically significant difference ($X^2 = 4.41$, $p < .05$, 1 df) between doctoral and master's institutions for dichotomous "Yes" vs. "Non-Yes" categories. In other words, approval of the degree in general was not between institutions offering graduate and undergraduate work, since master's institutions apparently did not indicate attitudes appreciably different from those of the undergraduate institutions.

Question 2: Would you be willing to hire, pay and promote D.A. degree holders on an equal basis with Ph.D. degree holders? This question was taken directly from the guidelines for development of the D.A. put forth by Dunham for the Carnegie Corporation. Among these guidelines is the following statement:

"No institution should develop D.A. programs simply for placement at other institutions. Its own faculty should be willing to hire, promote and pay D.A. degree holders on an equal basis with Ph.D. degree holders. This is the real test of commitment that will mean the difference between a first class and a second class degree" (Dunham, 1970a).

---

[6]For the statistically unsophisticated reader, the level of p in this case should be read as the probability of a significant difference occurring by chance is less than one in 100, or conversely, there is a 99 in 100 chance that a real difference is present. A $p < .05$ is also considered statistically significant. The latter is usually the upper conservative limit. Sometimes, as in this study, reference is made to almost significant p's, between .05 and .10.

[7]The word master's used throughout this study includes both master's and specialist's degrees.

Table 3 - Responses to Question 1, "Do you approve of the DA degree?"

Answer	Doctor's N	Doctor's %	Master's N	Master's %	Bachelor's N	Bachelor's %	Associate N	Associate %	Totals N	Totals %
Yes	19	59.4	22	84.6	27	79.4	53	89.8	121	80.1
No and Don't Know	13	40.7	4	15.4	7	20.6	6	10.2	30	19.9
Totals	32	100.1	26	100.0	34	100.0	59	100.0	151	100.0

It was because of this great stress on the fact that the D.A. was not to be launched as an inferior degree that Question 2 was asked exactly in Dunham's words. Question 2 in this study further urged those who answered in the negative, essentially thus denying equal employment status to D.A.'s, to skip questions 3 and 4--the former on employment of D.A.'s to teach in certain disciplines, and the latter on their employment at certain undergraduate levels.

Table 4 presents the data obtained from Question 2. Although the questionnaire provided for only a "Yes" or "No" answer, 13 respondents (8.6%) inserted a "Don't Know" answer or omitted answering the item completely. In view of this small N, it was again combined with the negatives to eliminate small cell entries. Once again, a large majority (75.5%) replied affirmatively to the question, but again the degree of affirmation was certainly not uniform. The test of the differences among the various levels of institutions was again highly statistically significant ($X^2 = 10.50$, $p < .02$, 3 df). About half (56.2%) of the doctoral schools answered affirmatively, while 86.4% of the junior colleges did so. The other two levels of institutions lay somewhere between them. In the original data, about a third (31.3%) of the doctoral schools answered absolutely negatively, but only 6.8% of the associate level schools did so. Again, the four-year colleges, while expressing about the same level of affirmation as the master's degree schools, asserted about three times the level of absolute negation as the latter in the original data (23.5% vs. 7.7%). However, if both negative and doubtful answers, each indicating a lack of affirmation, are combined as in Table 4, there is very little difference apparent on inspection between master's and baccalaureate schools (23.1% vs. 26.4%). Again, a test was run of the differences between the two levels of undergraduate schools with the negatives and doubtfuls combined. The resulting X^2 was 2.41, statistically insignificant for 1 df. Another X^2, with combined cells, of the difference between doctoral and master's schools, was 2.71, also statistically insignificant for 1 df. However p lay between .05 and .10 here, very close to significance.

Question 3: Would you see a D.A. employed in what disciplines? The rationale for the question was based on the fact that some individuals (e.g., Page, 1970; Shugrue, 1970) mentioned the D.A. as more the "degree of choice" or preferred degree for some disciplines, whereas the Ph.D. would be more the "degree of choice" for others. Mostly the distinction has been between the humanities in the former case and the sciences in the latter largely because of greater difficulty in execution of Ph.D. dissertations in humanistic fields. Some individuals (e.g. Smith, 1970) have urged the "reform" of the Ph.D. in a number of disciplines to make it more like a D.A., rather than to adopt the D.A.

It should be remembered that in Question 3 the respondent was asked not to answer if he had answered Question 2 negatively. But some respondents avoided a direct answer by printing in their own D.K.'s or avoiding any answer to Question 2 (see Table 4). According to Table 4, there should have been only 114 affirmative respondents, but obviously a few individuals who were uncertain chose to answer Question 3. We thus have a total of 119, instead of 114 as our total N for this question.

Table 4 - Responses to Question 2, "Would you be willing to hire, pay, and promote D.A. degree holders on an equal basis with Ph.D. degree holders?"

Answer	Doctor's N	Doctor's %	Master's N	Master's %	Bachelor's N	Bachelor's %	Associate N	Associate %	Totals N	Totals %
Yes	18	56.2	20	76.9	25	73.5	51	86.4	114	75.5
No, D.K., and No Ans.	14	43.8	6	23.1	9	26.4	8	13.6	37	24.5
Totals	32	100.0	26	100.0	34	99.9	59	100.0	151	100.0

Table 5 presents the data for Question 3. The basic distinction was between the answers "All" or "Some" in regard to what disciplines would be taught by the D.A. (However, a separate X^2 of a table including all 151 respondents, i.e., those saying essentially "All," "Some," or "None" was 18.19, $p < .01$, 6 df. This very statistically significant result is not unexpected in view of the thrust of Question 2.)

The chi-square test of the differences among the various levels of the 119 institutions was highly statistically significant ($X^2 = 11.59$, $p < .01$, 3 df). Again the difference was marked between doctoral and lesser level institutions, exactly half of the former saying "All," and half saying "Some." The master's and bachelor's institutions resembled each other very closely, and again the associate degree schools were very much willing to have D.A.'s teach all disciplines, 86.8% so indicating. In all, exactly three-quarters of all the 119 non-negative respondents said "All" and only one-quarter said "Some." Distinction between the two levels of undergraduate schools was again insignificant ($X^2 = 1.62$, 1 df). And again, the distinction between doctoral and master's schools, was very sharp in terms of percentages in Table 3. However, X^2 fell barely short of statistical significance ($X^2 = 2.87$, $.10 > p > .05$, 1 df).

Question 3, (part 2). If answer is "Some" please state which ones Yes and which ones No: 3a. Disciplines employing D.A. 3b. Disciplines not employing D.A. The answer to this part of Question 3 was of course quite difficult to analyze on two counts: (1) the omissions caused by the invitation not to answer Question 3 if Question 2 was replied to negatively; and (2) the open-ended nature of the response, so that the same respondent might fill in more than one discipline. (Open-endedness was deliberately used to avoid a check-list of a huge number of disciplines which would be too formidable and discourage replies.) The data could not therefore be tested statistically. However a total of 57 separately codable answers (each not necessarily independent) were received. Table 6 gives the data for these answers.

Table 6 is quite sketchy and incomplete because it is based on replies of about 30 respondents, i.e., only those replying "Some" to Question 3 and filling in 3a and 3b to some degree. It reveals 2-year colleges were most willing to have D.A.'s teach the traditional arts and sciences subjects. About four-fifths (83.3%) of 12 junior college positive answers involved these subjects, and the D.A. was not seen by them (55.6% of negative answers and no positive answers) as concerned with professional-technical teaching (business, education, engineering, paramedical, journalism, etc.). The other three levels of schools seemed to want D.A.'s more involved in this latter kind of teaching, although doctoral school responses were somewhat more mixed. The opinions given regarding arts and sciences subjects seemed to involve them in the humanities and social sciences more than in mathematics and the natural sciences. Doctoral schools, to some degree, did not want D.A.'s involved with any research teaching, which is understandable.

In all, focusing only on all arts and sciences subjects, we found 35 responses in the humanities-social sciences areas. Of these 35, 80.0% visualized D.A.'s employed teaching those subjects, and 20.0% did not. In the natural sciences and mathematics areas, there were 23 responses, with 39.1% which agreed D.A.'s should teach these subjects, and 60.9% which did not so agree. The D.A. degree

Table 5 - Responses to Question 3, "Would you see a D.A. employed in what disciplines?"*

Answer	Doctor's N	Doctor's %	Master's N	Master's %	Bachelor's N	Bachelor's %	Associate N	Associate %	Totals N	Totals %
All	11	50.0	14	73.7	18	72.0	46	86.8	89	74.8
Some	11	50.0	5	26.3	7	28.0	7	13.2	30	25.2
Totals	22	100.0	19	100.0	25	100.0	53	100.0	119	100.0

*Note: This table comprises answers given only by those responding "Yes" (N=114) plus a few (N=5) saying D.K. to Question 2. Breakdown for all 151 respondents is "all" (58.9%); "some" (19.9%); and "no answer" (21.1%).

Table 6 - Response to Questions 3a and 3b: Disciplines in Which D.A. Is and Is Not Employed*

3a. Disciplines employing D.A. (57 responses)

Discipline	Doctor's		Master's		Bachelor's		Associate	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Humanities	7	30.4	2	28.6	5	33.3	5	41.7
Social Science	4	17.4	2	28.6	1	6.7	2	16.7
Nat. Sci-Math	4	17.4	-	-	2	13.3	3	25.0
All A & S	15	65.2	4	57.2	8	53.3	10	83.4
Prof.-Tech	5	21.7	2	28.6	6	40.0	-	-
Any Non-Resch.	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Any Research	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Any Academic Area	1	4.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
Depends on Man or Prog.	-	-	1	14.2	1	6.7	2	16.7
Totals	23	99.9	7	100.0	15	100.0	12	100.0

3b. Disciplines not employing D.A. (36 responses)

Doctor's		Master's		Bachelor's		Associate	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
-	-	1	14.3	2	25.0	-	-
1	8.3	1	14.3	2	25.0	-	-
2	16.7	4	57.1	4	50.0	4	44.4
3	25.0	6	85.7	8	100.0	4	44.4
7	58.3	1	14.3	-	-	5	55.6
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	16.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
12	100.0	7	100.0	8	100.0	9	100.0

*Note: Horizontal totals not supplied because text discussion focuses partially on 3a and 3b combined

holder was thus principally visualized by those answering Questions 3a and 3b as one who, as far as arts and sciences teaching went, was prepared to handle the generally non-quantitative and non-laboratory subjects. The finding is indeed interesting in view of the fact that Carnegie-Mellon and other universities have concentrated on developing a D.A. in the sciences, among other areas.

Question 4: If employed, do you visualize a D.A. teaching at which levels? The rationale for this question also runs throughout the writings about the D.A. Would it be a degree that would only serve the two-year or community colleges? Indeed, Wortham (1967) makes a special plea for the D.A. to prepare people to teach in junior colleges. However, the official statements on the D.A. issued by the AASCU and by the CGS delineate it as a degree designed to prepare students for careers as college teachers, and no specification is made about the sorts of colleges in which they will teach, nor in which of the four college year levels they will be most competent. Hence the format of our question.

Table 7 presents the data on Question 4. It too, like Question 3, had a trimmed down number of respondents (121) from the original 151, the bulk of whom were forced out by Question 2. (Again, a separate X^2 of a table including all 151 respondents, with a fifth category of "no response"--essentially a negative answer category--yielded a very large and significant chi-square of 23.16, $p<.01$, 9 df).

Table 7 is interesting in a number of ways. No respondent among the 121 (nor for that matter among the original 151) was willing to confine a D.A. to teaching freshmen exclusively. However, each institution seemed to answer Question 4 in a parochial fashion. Of the 22 eligible doctoral respondents, almost three-fourths (72.7%) visualized D.A.'s teaching all four years. Perhaps some constriction of full endorsement existed here because teachers at these schools instruct both graduates and undergraduates in upper division. A smaller segment (18.2%) saw them as teaching only two years--perhaps to the huge lecture sections? The M.A. and 4-year schools overwhelmingly endorsed them as teachers for all four undergraduate years. More than one quarter (28.3%) of the 2-year schools endorsed them for two-year or lower division teaching only, although the majority still viewed them as four-year teachers. On the whole, among all respondents, three of four (75.2%) of those who would employ D.A.'s--hire, pay, and promote them on an equal basis with Ph.D. degree holders--would have them teaching all four years. It is still interesting, however, that about one in four of these "liberal" respondents would restrict their teaching to something less than the senior level. A statistical analysis of the data in Table 7 yielded a X^2 of 15.38, $p<.02$, 6 df. The attitudes about levels of teaching thus differed very significantly among the various types of institutions.

Further analysis of Question 4, contrasting bachelor's and associate level schools and combining cells into two categories (less-than-4 years vs. 4 years) yielded a X^2 of 6.67, $p<.01$, 1 df. In this 2 x 2 comparison, the parochialism mentioned above was thus very marked among the undergraduate level schools. A similar 2 x 2 table of doctoral vs. master's schools gave an insignificant $X^2 = 1.51$, despite fairly strong contrasts in Table 7.

Question 5. Some think the Ph.D. degree frequently doesn't fulfill the claim that the dissertation must contain a really original contribution to

Table 7 - Responses to Question 4, "If employed, do you visualize a D.A. teaching at which levels?"*

Answer	Doctor's		Master's		Bachelor's		Associate		Totals	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Lower division only	4	18.2	1	4.3	-	-	15	28.3	20	16.5
First 3 years only	2	9.1	1	4.3	1	4.3	6	11.3	10	8.3
All 4 years	16	72.7	21	91.3	22	95.7	32	60.4	91	75.2
Totals	22	100.0	23	99.9	23	100.0	53	100.0	121	100.0

*Note: This table comprises answers given only by those responding "Yes" (N = 114) plus a few (N = 7) saying D.K. to Question 2. Breakdown for all 151 respondents is "no answer" (19.9%); "lower division only" (13.2%);"first 3 years only" (6.6%); and "all 4 years" (60.3%).

knowledge. In some fields, Ph.D. dissertations are difficult to execute because of this demand. In your opinion, is a Ph.D. dissertation in its present form a necessary qualification for training an undergraduate teacher? This question is really a very crucial one and is discussed at length in the literature on college teaching. Crozier (1968), for example, complains about the "Ph.D. stretchout" and the A.B.D. ("all but dissertation") problems. The fact that numbers of universities are changing the nature of the Ph.D. dissertation (see discussion of results later on) and one reads therefore of "revised" or "reformed" Ph.D.'s is evidence of the seriousness of this question. Also, of course, there is the incontrovertible argument that is amply buttressed, i.e., that most Ph.D.'s publish little or nothing after their dissertations and hence are trained to do a job, at least as far as undergraduate instruction goes, they will not perform after award of their degrees.

A preliminary count of 150 answers (one M.A. school did not answer) to Question 5 indicated the following percentages of response: "not at all," 34.0; "probably not," 47.3; "undecided," 4.7; "probably yes," 11.3; and "very much so," 2.7. Thus the greatest number (81.3%) answered in the negative, and only 14.0% in the positive. As a result, of the 20 cell entries, 11 or more than one half gave expected frequencies of less than five, undesirable for X^2 analysis. Therefore the negative and positive cells were combined and the few cases (7) of "undecided" eliminated to create Table 8, which has increased cell numbers.

Table 8 yielded a X^2 of 7.88, $p<.05$, 3 df. This highly significant figure was brought about by the obviously marked contrast between the 2-year level schools and the remainder of the institutions. Almost 95% of the former answered Question 5 negatively. A further analysis yielded $X^2 = 4.08$, $p<.05$, df = 1 in a 2 x 2 table contrasting the two levels of undergraduate institutions. Indeed the bachelor's schools appeared somewhat the harshest of all in their judgments. A test of the difference between the doctoral and master's schools gave $X^2 = .002$, statistically very insignificant.

The remarkable fact about Table 8 is that 85.3% of all respondents answered in the negative. The reader who objects that the question may have been a "leading" one and was therefore "loaded" by its format--as well as by materials in Appendix B--should remember that the doctoral schools had given only a 56.2% "yes" response to Question 2, about willingness to hire, pay, and promote D.A. degree holders equally with Ph.D. Also even among those in this group willing to employ D.A.'s, only one half would have them teaching in all disciplines, according to Table 5. Their original answers to Question 5, however, were 75.0% negative, 6.3% undecided, and only 18.7% positive. Thus, it is not at all obvious that these respondents, at least, were easily taken in by the format of Question 5.

Question 6, In terms of prestige, how do you personally perceive the D.A. degree? The rationale for this question (as well as that for Question 7) is obvious. Throughout all the arguments for the degree runs a spectre--the concern that somehow it will be an "inferior" degree to the Ph.D. because it will demand less, that its dissertation requirements will be less, that it will become like the Ed.D., that it will be captured by professional "educationists," that it will be offered as a consolation prize to those unable to achieve the Ph.D., that it will train people to teach at lesser schools, that it will be

Table 8 - Responses to Question 5, "In your opinion, is a Ph.D. dissertation in its present form a necessary qualification for training an undergraduate college teacher?"

Answer	Doctor's		Master's		Bachelor's		Associate		Totals	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
"Not at all and probably not"	24	80.0	20	83.3	23	74.2	55	94.8	122	85.3
"Probably yes and very much so"	6	20.0	4	16.7	8	25.8	3	5.2	21	14.7
Totals	30	100.0	24	100.0	31	100.0	58	100.0	143	100.0

offered by less prestigious universities, that time spent on teaching people to teach is better spent on mastering a subject-matter field or doing research--which is more "prestigious" than teaching, that its emphasis on breadth would dilute the specialization needed to teach a discipline well, etc., etc. These same feelings are, of course, behind the rationale for Question 2.

The word "prestige" indeed bothered some of our correspondents. One large, prestigious doctoral institution respondent refused to answer Questions 6 and 7 but sent an accompanying letter. Another doctoral respondent stated, "Realistically the D.A. will have to prove its claims. We will cheer it on its way." One associate degree level respondent stated, "Poor question--I give it high prestige for it better meets our needs. I realize, however, senior institutions will pay it less prestige." And another two-year level respondent, circling the word "prestige," exploded, "This is a damn bad word to use! It isn't worth a nickel as far as need is concerned!"

Table 9 presents the data from Question 6. Two doctoral level respondents did not answer; also only three respondents (one M.A. school and two associate level schools) rated the D.A. "higher than the Ph.D." These three constituted only 2.0% of the total of 149 remaining respondents, and so essentially the choice was between "about the same as Ph.D." or "less than Ph.D." for the remaining 146. Table 9 is therefore based on the replies of that number. A statistical analysis of the data yielded a $X^2 = 15.72$, $p < .01$, 3 df. This highly statistically significant difference is readily apparent in the expressed attitudes shown in the table. Seven of 10 of respondents from doctoral institutions personally perceived the D.A. as less prestigious than the Ph.D. Respondents from the intermediate institutions, master's and bachelor's, gave about the same results--about half of each thought the D.A. equally as prestigious and half as less prestigious than the Ph.D. However, the associate level schools' respondents thought the D.A. was about as prestigious as the Ph.D. in three out of four instances.

Table 9, on inspection, offers one of the sharpest contrasts between the two undergraduate level schools and also between the two graduate level ones. A 2 x 2 analysis for bachelor's contrasted with A.A. levels yielded a significant X^2 of 4.08, $p < .05$, 1 df. A similar 2 x 2 analysis for the two graduate level institutions yielded a X^2 of 3.79, which barely missed being significant at the .05 level (X^2 must be 3.84, 1 df, for this level of significance). The clue to understanding the data of Table 9 may lie simply in the remarks made by the two associate degree respondents cited above--they perceived the D.A. as better satisfying their needs than the Ph.D.; the doctoral level institutions also needed the Ph.D. to fulfill their mission and accordingly gave it less prestige. However, Table 9, which shows more than half of master's and bachelor's institutions rating the D.A. equally as prestigious as the Ph.D. should lay to rest the fears that the D.A. will be only a degree to prepare individuals to teach at two-year institutions.

Question 7. In terms of prestige, how do you suppose your present typical faculty member would perceive the D.A. degree? This question was phrased because, again in the higher education literature, faculties, especially those in more prestigious schools, are often seen as slow to change, basically loyal to their own disciplines rather than to their institutions or the teaching process,

Table 9 - Responses to Question 6, " In terms of prestige how do you personally perceive the D.A. degree?"

Answer	Doctor's		Master's		Bachelor's		Associate		Totals	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
About the same as Ph.D.	9	30.0	14	56.0	18	52.9	42	73.7	83	56.8
Less than Ph.D.	21	70.0	11	44.0	16	47.1	15	26.3	63	43.2
Totals	30	100.0	25	100.0	34	100.0	57	100.0	146	100.0

and preoccupied in preserving their own kind. Epperson (1970) describes a set of beliefs permeating the "faculty culture" which are incompatible with a more development-oriented (i.e., student-oriented or teacher-scholar oriented) set of attitudes. It was thought then that administrators, charged with educational leadership and greater sensitivity to change might profess one set of attitudes, but would attribute another set to their faculties. Of course, it would have been better to contact faculties directly to answer this question, but this was impossible.

Table 10 presents the data in response to Question 7. Two doctoral respondents and two associate level ones did not answer the question: also only one respondent (in an A.A. school) said "higher than Ph.D." These few cases (only 2.6% of the total of 151 respondents) were discarded. Thus the contrast was again between "about the same as the Ph.D." and "less than the Ph.D.," with $\underline{N} = 147$.

A statistical analysis of Table 10 yielded $X^2 = 20.67$, $\underline{p} < .001$, 3 df. This was one of the two most statistically significant X^2's obtained in the present study. All levels of respondents said their typical faculty member would perceive the D.A. as less prestigious than the Ph.D.--indeed, as even considerably less prestigious than they themselves were willing to acknowledge. Even among the A.A. level schools, more than half the administrators viewed their faculty members as rating the D.A. less prestigious, and this was in marked contrast to their own professed views in Table 9. A 2 x 2 table contrasting four-year and two-year institutions yielded $X^2 = 8.51$, $\underline{p} < .01$, 1 df. The attributed perceptions of the typical faculty members at these institutions were thus statistically significantly different. The same type of contrast between the two graduate level institutions yielded an insignificant X^2 of 1.99.

The reader will undoubtedly be intrigued with the comparison between Tables 9 and 10. Globally, over half (56.8%) of the respondents themselves said they would rate the D.A. equally as prestigious as the Ph.D.; on the other hand, they felt that about one-quarter (27.9%) of their faculties would do the same.

These data led us to compare the two sets of responses at three levels. These were Same, i.e., the administrator-respondent saw the faculty member rating the D.A. at the same level as himself; Higher, i.e., the respondent saw the D.A. as higher but said the faculty would rate it lower; and Lower, i.e., the respondent personally perceived the D.A. as lower in prestige than the typical faculty member. Table 11 gives the data for these contrasts, with five cases being unuseable. Whereas the data in Table 11 indicate a greater sharing of perceptions of doctoral respondents and those attributed by them to "typical faculty members" and less of such sharing among lower levels of institutions, the contrast is not dramatic enough, for X^2 was 7.73, statistically insignificant for 6 df. The note for Table 11 explains why a contrast of "same" is considered less favorable to the D.A.

Question 8: If in either No. 6 or No. 7 above you checked "less than Ph.D." please state why. As with the second part of Question 3, the response to this question was left deliberately open-ended. Also, as with Questions 3a and 3b, it was possible for a respondent to give more than one answer; hence, no statistical analysis was possible. However, unlike Questions 3a and 3b, a very large number (107) of respondents replied. In all, there were 147 separate

Table 10 - Responses to Question 7, "In terms of prestige, how do you suppose your present typical faculty member would perceive the D.A. degree?"

Answer	Doctor's N	Doctor's %	Master's N	Master's %	Bachelor's N	Bachelor's %	Associate N	Associate %	Totals N	Totals %
About the same as Ph.D.	2	6.5	6	23.1	6	17.6	27	48.2	41	27.9
Less than Ph.D.	29	93.5	20	76.9	28	82.4	29	51.8	106	72.1
Totals	31	100.0	26	100.0	34	100.0	56	100.0	147	100.0

Table 11 - Contrast Between Questions 6 and 7, Perceptions of Respondents and Their Attributed Perceptions of Typical Faculty Members*

Answer	Doctor's		Master's		Bachelor's		Associate		Totals	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Same	23	76.7	15	60.0	22	64.7	34	59.6	94	64.4
Higher	7	23.3	9	36.0	12	35.3	18	31.6	46	31.5
Lower	-	-	1	4.0	-	-	5	8.8	6	4.1
Totals	30	100.0	25	100.0	34	100.0	57	100.0	146	100.0

*This table should be interpreted so that the higher the percentage in the "Same" row, the less favorability to the D.A. It would reflect much more agreement with faculty opinion which Table 10 shows to be typically negative. Therefore, opposition to the D.A. would be expected to be greater because of more agreement of opinion between administrator and faculty.

codeable responses and it was possible to reduce these to eight general categories. These were: (1) pejorative--comments such as "lacks rigor," "selective factors are lower," "general requirements are lower," "no scholarly status," etc., including depreciatory comparisons with the Ed.D. such as "several have compared it to Ed.D. as second rate" and comments generally expressing resentment of it by those holding the Ph.D.; (2) tradition--use of the word specifically plus comments such as "the long time acceptance level of the Ph.D."; (3) unproven--again use of the word or comments such as "at present there are far few D.A.'s in the U.S. who have had an opportunity to establish a professional image"; (4) research orientation preferred--"needs research to teach," etc.; (5) reform the Ph.D. instead; (6) good only for undergraduate teaching; (7) ignorance about the D.A.--"because of unfamiliarity with the program," etc.

The data for Question 8 are presented in Table 12. In all, the pejorative comments were most frequent, about four in ten, with associate level schools being least derogatory and the four-year schools being somewhat more harsh than the rest. About three in ten of the responses referred to tradition, a reason which climbed from 17.1% of doctoral responses to 50.0% of the A.A. responses, with other schools offering it about one-quarter of the time. The fact that the D.A. was perceived as having less prestige than the Ph.D. because it was unproven constituted 22.0% of the doctoral responses, but only 10.0% of the A.A. responses--again the other schools lay between. About ten per cent of each of the graduate level schools stressed the preference for a research orientation, only 5.3% of the 4-year college responses mentioned it, and none of the 2-year schools did. This is quite logical, of course, but it is somewhat surprising that it was specifically mentioned so infrequently although it may have been inferred in the pejorative group. A small number referred to the fact that the Ph.D. should be reformed instead--these were among graduate institutions only. (Essentially this was not a direct answer to the question.) A tiny minority felt the D.A. lacked prestige because it was destined only for undergraduate teaching or because people were ignorant about it.

Although pejorative comments are the most frequent in Table 12, it should be noted here that, if the categories of "tradition" and "unproven" are combined, each implying some time dimension, 44.9% of all the responses seem to imply a "wait and see" attitude--that in fact, the D.A. must prove itself over time to counteract the long tradition of Ph.D. preparation for college teaching.

Question 9. How do you perceive the training of a D.A. for undergraduate college teaching as compared with the Ph.D.? The rationale for this question is obvious--this is essentially what the D.A. is all about. Of the 151 respondents, eight (5.3%) did not answer the question, and a statistical analysis was applied to the remaining 143 replies.

Table 13 presents data for Question 9. The X^2 was 6.20, statistically insignificant for 6 df. There was very little difference among the attitudes of the various degree level institutions, although the highest ratings were given by A.A. level respondents. Only one of 55 (1.8%) of the latter rated the D.A. as "worse than the Ph.D." At first blush, the overall finding of lack of significance may be surprising, especially in view of our earlier findings, but it is apparent that the respondents had paid careful attention to the question, in which the words "training" and "undergraduate" were emphasized and that the statistically insignificant results were apparently a result of this. More than

Table 12 - Responses to Question 8, "If you checked prestige 'less than Ph.D.' please state why."*

Answer	Doctor's N	%	Master's N	%	Bachelor's N	%	Associate N	%	Totals N	%
Pejorative	18	43.9	12	42.9	19	50.0	14	35.0	63	42.9
Tradition	7	17.1	7	25.0	10	26.3	20	50.0	44	29.9
Unproven	9	22.0	4	14.3	5	13.2	4	10.0	22	15.0
Research orient. preferred	4	9.8	3	10.7	2	5.3	-	-	9	6.1
Reform Ph.D.	2	4.9	2	7.1	-	-	-	-	4	2.7
Undergraduate teaching	-	-	-	-	1	2.6	1	2.5	2	1.4
Ignorance about D.A.	1	2.4	-	-	1	2.6	1	2.5	3	2.0
Totals	41	100.1	28	100.0	38	100.0	40	100.0	147	100.0

*Note: The total for this table (147) is the number of separate responses, not respondents.

Table 13 - Responses to Question 9, "How do you perceive the training of a D.A. for undergraduate college teaching as compared with the Ph.D.?"

Answer	Doctor's N	Doctor's %	Master's N	Master's %	Bachelor's N	Bachelor's %	Associate N	Associate %	Totals N	Totals %
Better than Ph.D.	16	55.2	13	52.0	18	52.9	33	60.0	80	55.9
About the same as Ph.D.	9	31.0	10	40.0	11	32.4	21	38.2	51	35.7
Worse than Ph.D.	4	13.8	2	8.0	5	14.7	1	1.8	12	8.4
Totals	29	100.0	25	100.0	34	100.0	55	100.0	143	100.0

half (55.9%) of all respondents felt the D.A. training was better, about a third (35.7%) thought it about the same, and less than one in ten (8.4%) appraised it as worse. It may be safely concluded that any negativism towards the degree is not based on its approach to training graduate students for undergraduate teaching. More will be said about Question 9 later on under "Discussion of Results."

Question 10: If you feel that all college teachers should have a doctorate and that there is room for both D.A.'s and Ph.D.'s, what do you conceive to be about the right percentage mix of faculty with each degree in your institution? The question was to be answered by filling in two numbers, one for the percentage of D.A.'s and the other for the percentage of Ph.D.'s and was intended to further explore the contrasts between the two principal degrees, but many respondents took exception to it. There were a considerable number of omissions, especially by the 2-year level institutions. Many of them made remarks such as "I don't feel that all college teachers should have a doctorate," or "The doctorate level of academic preparation is totally unnecessary for junior college teaching." The numbers of omissions and the great frequency of repetition of statements about not needing doctoral level people to teach were in marked contrast to the much fewer numbers of omissions and remarks by the higher level institutions. The latter would make statements such as, "I can't define the right percentage," or "It doesn't matter if the training is good," or "Let's be realistic, there will always be some without either." Sometimes the percentages were filled in by the latter in addition to the remarks.

The matter of omissions led us to explore simply whether or not there would be significant differences among the various levels of institutions with regard to this variable. Table 14 presents the data on this problem, and they are indeed surprising, for statistical analysis revealed a X^2 of 31.61, $p < .001$, 3 df. There is thus a highly statistically significant difference among the various levels of institutions in their willingness to answer Question 10 by inserting figures in the appropriate boxes for the answer to the question. This serendipitous finding can easily be interpreted by inspection of the figures in the table, along with evaluation of the many spontaneous remarks cited above. About two-thirds (64.4%) of the A.A. schools omitted answering the question, but only one-quarter (25.0%) of the doctoral schools did so. Again, we find that the 4-year institutions seem to resemble the higher level schools more than they do the 2-year institutions. (A test of the difference between doctoral and master's schools yielded $X^2 = 0.64$ which was statistically insignificant. However the difference between 2-year and 4-year schools yielded $X^2 = 10.58$, $p < .01$, 1 df.)

The whole picture, both qualitative and quantitative, adds up to the fact that the 2-year institutions do not currently perceive need for doctorates, whether D.A.'s or Ph.D.'s, on their faculties. In the beginning wording of the question, "If you feel that all college teachers should have a doctorate," the conditional "if" and the provision of only two boxes for doctorates, but none for any lesser degrees, had invited them not to answer the question at all.

Turning now to the 86 respondents who answered Question 10, data on their replies are presented in Table 15. Answers were tabulated in terms of percentage of D.A.'s in the "mix" of D.A.'s and Ph.D.'s in their institutions. Means range from 34.58% for doctoral institutions to 71.19% for A.A. schools.

Table 14 - Omissions of Answers to Question 10

Answer	Doctor's N	Doctor's %	Master's N	Master's %	Bachelor's N	Bachelor's %	Associate N	Associate %	Totals N	Totals %
Omitted	8	25.0	9	34.6	10	29.4	38	64.4	65	43.0
Not omitted	24	75.0	17	65.4	24	70.6	21	35.6	86	57.0
Totals	32	100.0	26	100.0	34	100.0	59	100.0	151	100.0

Table 15 - Responses to Question 10, Percentages of D.A's Given by Those Responding to the Question

Per Cent D.A's	Doctor's	Master's	Bachelor's	Associate	Totals
100	-	-	-	3	3
90-99	-	-	-	3	3
80-89	-	1	3	1	5
70-79	2	5	2	6	15
60-69	4	3	3	3	13
50-59	5	6	4	4	19
40-49	-	-	3	-	3
30-39	1	1	3	-	5
20-29	5	1	4	1	11
10-19	3	-	2	-	5
0- 9	4	-	-	-	4
Totals	24	17	24	21	86
Mean	34.58	57.65	45.63	71.19	51.16
S.D.	23.38	16.12	21.96	20.12	21.40

Again, the four-year schools are less liberal than the master's degree-granting institutions. Interestingly enough, the grand mean for all schools is 51.16%, indicating about a half and half "mix" of D.A.'s and Ph.D.'s when level of institution is disregarded.

A simple analysis of variance (AV) of the data yielded an F ratio of 11.99, $p < .001$, df = 3/82. There is thus a high degree of statistically significant difference between one or more means in the group of four. Using a t after F test, the following mean differences proved to be very significant: (1) the difference of 36.61% between associate and doctoral schools, $t = 5.72$, $p < .01$; (2) the difference of 25.56% between bachelor's and associate schools, $t = 3.99$, $p < .01$; and (3) the difference of 23.07% between doctoral and master's schools, $t = 3.40$, $p < .01$. It should be remembered that there is some unknown bias in these results, since they are based on answers supplied only by those who answered Question 10. The results, however, are not inconsistent with earlier findings showing differences in attitudes between the two levels of undergraduate and the two levels of graduate institutions.

In order to discuss our results in a more integrated fashion in the next section, the findings are condensed in Table 16, which presents a summary of the statistical analyses.

Reference to Table 16 reveals that of 11 significance tests performed nine were significant. Of these nine, eight may be said to be directly concerned with the D.A. and one indirectly concerned. The eight of direct concern are: Q. 1 (approve D.A.); Q. 2 (hire, pay, promote equally); Q. 3 (employed in all or some disciplines); Q. 4 (year-levels of teaching); Q. 5 (dissertation); Q. 6 (personally perceived prestige); Q. 7 (faculty perceived prestige); and 10 (per cent of D.A. in "mix"). The significant one of indirect concern is 10b dealing with the willingness to answer Q. 10, and involves desire to have either D.A. or Ph.D. on the faculty. Q. 6 contrasted with Q. 7 gives some insight into whether administrators rating themselves and their faculties see "eye to eye" with the latter, and even though statistically insignificant, may give some clue to "solidarity of acceptance" of the degree by both groups as will be noted in the next table. Only one question (Q. 9, training for undergraduate teaching) pertaining directly to the D.A. itself, was insignificant.

In testing the significance of attitudes between the two levels of graduate institutions, we find that, according to Table 16, there are two instances of a statistically significant difference--Q. 1 and Q. 10--and in both cases master's schools are more favorable than doctor's. Three cases (Q. 2, 3, and 6) are significant between the five and ten per cent levels, and in each case the master's schools are more favorable than doctor's.

One of our most crucial findings lies in the fact that, when we contrast the two levels of undergraduate institutions, the four-year colleges do not perceive the D.A. in a fashion exactly similar to the two-year colleges. They are statistically significantly different in their responses to Q. 4, Q. 5, Q. 6, Q. 7, and Q. 10. Also, Q. 10b indicates a significant difference between the two institutions--the four-year colleges more often answer Q. 10, indicating their greater need for doctorate level teaching of any type.

Table 16 - Summary of Significance Tests
Among and Between Institutions

Question Number		Significant overall?	Sig. between grad. level schools?	Sig. between undergraduate level schools?
1.	Approve D.A.	Yes	Yes	No
2.	Hire, pay, promote equal to Ph.D.	Yes	No, almost (.05 to .10 level)	No
3.	Employed in disciplines	Yes	No, almost (.05 to .10 level)	No
4.	Employed what year levels	Yes	No	Yes
5.	Dissertation	Yes	No	Yes
6.	Personally perceived prestige	Yes	No, almost (.05 to .10 level)	Yes
7.	Faculty perceived prestige	Yes	No	Yes
6. vs 7.	Personal vs faculty prestige	No	No test run	No test run
9.	Training	No	No test run	No test run
10.	% DA in "mix"	Yes	Yes	Yes
10b.	Omission of Q. 10	Yes	No	Yes

One final table (Table 17) will help further to comprehend the earlier data. It concerns the degree of favorability to the D.A. (1 is high, and 4 is low) by simply rank ordering the percentages in each table. The favorable response is indicated in each case in the table. The only items that need some explanation are Numbers 4 and 8. Item 4 considers the response favorable to the D.A., if it answers the "year levels taught" in Table 7 with "4 years." However, the parochial answers to this question, as noted previously cause the only serious reversal in ranks between the two levels of undergraduate schools. Item 8, comparing personally perceived vs. faculty perceived prestige, counts it as unfavorable to the D.A. if the administrator rates himself and his "typical faculty member" the same in attitude about prestige. If this is so, then one must expect a more solid phalanx of opposition to the degree.

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

The reactions of the 151 respondents taken collectively indicated a generally favorable reaction towards the Doctor of Arts. Of the eight questions asking directly about the degree, and to which the great majority or all 151 replied, seven showed majority approval. The percentages were as follows: Q. 1, "approve," 80%; Q. 2, "hire, pay, and promote," 76%; Q. 3, "teach all disciplines," 59%; Q. 4, "teach all four years," 60%; Q. 5, "negative on Ph.D.-type dissertation," 81%; Q. 6, "administrator-perceived prestige about the same," 57%; Q. 9, "better preparation for undergraduate teaching," 56%. Only Q. 7, "faculty-perceived prestige about the same" yielded an overall low percentage, 28%.

Examination of Tables 16 and 17, and the more detailed analyses presented in the earlier tables, however, lead to the general overall conclusion that receptivity to the Doctor of Arts degree was by no means uniform. Table 17 particularly indicates a rather remarkable consistency--the most favorable rankings were given to the D.A. by the associate level schools, next by the master's schools, third by the bachelor's, and lastly by the doctor's. The consistently reversed position of the master's and bachelor's schools is one of our most striking findings.

We shall first pay attention to the doctor's degree-granting schools. These are the expected producers of the new degree, although the Carnegie Corporation has not necessarily given grant support for its development only to the most prestigious Ph.D.-producing institutions. As noted earlier, although about three-fifths of them approved of the degree (Table 3) only slightly more than half would "hire, pay, and promote" the D.A. degree holder on an equal basis with the Ph.D. (Table 4). If we take <u>all</u> 32 respondents, we find about an equal number--one third in each category--saying "all," "some," or "none" to what disciplines the D.A. would teach. Again, taking <u>all</u> respondents, we note them split exactly half and half about D.A.'s teaching all four undergraduate years vs. less than four or not at all. (These figures are easily derived from Tables 5 and 7, although the latter were analyzed only for those replying affirmatively to Question 3.) Seven out of ten believed the prestige of the D.A. to be less (Table 9), and were willing to state that it would be even less, about 94% of the time, among their faculties (Table 10). They were very much in accord with their faculties (saying "same" three out of four times--Table 11). Also they were more prone than other schools to make pejorative comments about the D.A. and to say it was unproven in about two-thirds of the comments in Table 12. The percentage of D.A.'s they would hire in a D.A.-Ph.D. mix was quite low (about 35%) according to Table 15. (It may have been lower, since not all answered Q. 10.)

Table 17 - Rank Order of Favorability to D.A.
with Favorable Answers Indicated

	Doctor's	Master's	Bachelor's	Associate
1. Approve D.A. (Table 3-Yes)	4	2	3	1
2. Hire, pay, promote (Table 4-Yes)	4	2	3	1
3. Employed (Table 5-All)	4	2	3	1
4. Levels (Table 7-4 years)	3	2	1	4
5. Dissertation (Table 8-Negative)	3	2	4	1
6. Personal Prestige (Table 9-About same as Ph.D.)	4	2	3	1
7. Faculty Prestige (Table 10-About same as Ph.D.	4	2	3	1
8. Personal vs. Faculty Prestige (Table 11-Same)	4	2	3	1
9. Non-pejorative Comments (Table 12)	3	2	4	1
10. Training for Teaching (Table 13-Better than + Same as Ph.D.)	3	2	4	1
11. Percentage Mix (Table 15-Mean Percentage)	4	2	3	1
Median Rank	4	2	3	1

However, it may be noted that their position was rather inconsistent in that about four times in five they said the Ph.D. dissertation in its present form was "probably not" or "not at all" necessary for preparation of undergraduate teachers (Table 8). Some 55% also said that the D.A. training for teaching undergraduates was better than the Ph.D., and more than eight in ten agreed that it was better than or equal to that of the Ph.D. (Table 13).

Thus, there is real cause for concern here and perhaps is the grounds for the statements made by Dunham (1970a) mentioned earlier, that "no institution should develop D.A. programs simply for placement at other institutions," that they should be willing to treat DA's equally with Ph.D.'s and that this is the real test of commitment to a first class degree. Dunham iterates this in an article which appeared about the time of Wingspread. In that paper, he goes on to say:

> "...Major research universities will have difficulty meeting this test, but they must join in the cause. Otherwise, we run the risk of real tragedy. Many prestigious universities turned their backs when mass secondary education, with its need for a large number of teachers, became a reality. Teacher education was left to the teachers colleges. We face a similar danger now as we move into mass higher education. If the major institutions turn their backs once again, they are likely to regret that decision in the future even more than they have regretted the consequences of their inaction at the secondary level. Current graduate student disenchantment with Ph.D. programs is likely to be an impetus in the right direction" (Dunham 1970b, p. 512).

The official statement on the D.A. by the Council of Graduate Schools also says the following:

> "Admission, retention, and degree standards for a Doctor of Arts program should be as rigorous as those prevailing for a Ph.D. program and should be under the control of the graduate faculty of the subject-matter field. Under no circumstances should the Doctor of Arts be utilized as a consolation prize or second class attenuated Ph.D. While program requirements will inevitably differ because of different objectives, requirements for the Doctor of Arts should be no less demanding. If it is awarded at the completion of a program equal in quality and rigor to the Ph.D., its recipients should be employed in their areas of competence on a comparable basis to those holding the Ph.D. The standards and reputation of the graduate school awarding the degree are the significant determinants" (Council of Graduate Schools, 1970, pp. 6-7).

If the Carnegie Corporation's and CGS's caveats about willingness to "hire, promote, and pay" D.A. degree holders and to treat them with equal respect to Ph.D.'s mean anything, it would appear from our results that they rest much more lightly on doctoral degree institutions than they do on lesser level schools. Unfortunately, the current collapse in the Ph.D. employment market in colleges may have accentuated this problem.

The master's institutions, as already noted in Table 17, were the second most "liberal," among all four groups of institutions. In general,

across all questions, as we examined the data, they were somewhat more accepting of the D.A. than the four-year schools. A very sharp difference from the latter was shown in Question 4, if we look at the total numbers in both groups, rather than at the data in Table 7 which had eliminated all those not saying "yes" to Question 2. Among all master's schools, in this instance, 80.8% of respondents visualized the D.A. teaching at all four year levels. However, among all bachelor's schools, only 64.7% gave an unqualified answer of "all four years." Also, the master's respondents' attitudes on the dissertation (Table 8), their willingness to say that the D.A.'s training for teaching was better than or about the same as the Ph.D.'s (Table 13), and their greater mean percentage of D.A.'s in a "mix" (Table 15) indicate a greater degree of D.A. acceptance than the bachelor's schools. The answers to these questions may give a rather tenuous clue to their greater acceptance. Most of these institutions were public state universities--many of them former teachers colleges. In looking within the master's grouping, there were 17 public and nine private institutions. Although we had said earlier there were no statistically significant differences between public and private schools, and this is still true within the master's group, in seven out of ten comparisons, the former were more liberal. However, within the bachelor's group there was no such distinction, even though the four-year public bachelor's only schools are perhaps smaller versions of what the M.A. schools were only a few years ago (cf. Table 2). As a matter of fact, visual inspection of the contrast between public master's and public bachelor's schools revealed the latter to be less accepting in nine of ten comparisons. (However, we must point out the comparatively small N's in both cases.)

This more liberal acceptance by the master's institutions leads us to probe Dunham's statements when he talks about what he calls the "Colleges of the Forgotten Americans." He says, about these institutions:

> "First let me illustrate more concretely what goes on in one sector of the academic world. In the spring of 1968 I visited a number of state college campuses while in the process of putting together a study of these public four-year colleges and regional universities for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Mostly former teachers colleges, the membership of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities consists of roughly 275 institutions enrolling a quarter of all students in higher education. Expanding their enrollments rapidly and trying on different functions, many of these places have an identity problem.... Community colleges have charted their course and the traditional state universities likewise have their sights set, but the emerging or developing public institutions in the middle are much in a quandary as to their roles. Despite the debate, the direction of their movement is in my opinion, appallingly clear " (Dunham, 1970b, pp. 506-507).

He goes on to argue that this movement is toward a Harvard-Berkeley-Michigan model, towards prestige and status, towards hiring research-oriented Ph.D.'s not interested in teaching the type of average undergraduate found in these institutions. He predicts that these new, younger Ph.D.'s will gradually outvote the older professors who have education degrees.

That these public four-year colleges and regional universities have an "identity problem" is very clear from inspection across ten questions we

examined. However this problem seems to exist between institutional levels, rather than across them. As noted above, there seems to be much disagreement between public master's and public four-year colleges. The high degree of acceptance of the D.A. shown by our master's respondents at the present moment in time does not reflect a move toward a prestige-university model but perhaps still reflects more of a teachers college type of tradition. On the other hand, smaller four-year public colleges may be still clinging to more of a Ph.D.-teaching model or perhaps striving to differentiate their images from those of community colleges. We can only surmise here, because of our rather small numbers, but the fact that there is "quandary (of) roles," as Dunham suggests, does exist but perhaps not for the main reason he suggests. Further expansion of this study, with larger N's should help clarify this problem.

The four-year colleges' responses were also quite interesting, if we examine Tables 16 and 17. Overall, the majority approved of the D.A., were willing to treat D.A. holders equally, felt they could teach in all disciplines, would use them at all year levels, etc., etc. Yet generally, their attitudes were next to least accepting, after those of the doctoral schools. But probably the most intriguing finding is that, as noted before in Table 16, in six of nine X^2 tests run, they were significantly differentiated from the two-year level colleges as less accepting. No public-private dichotomy gave any clue to the cause of this situation. Looking within the private schools themselves, there were 17 schools which were purely liberal arts colleges, and eight which said they were liberal arts plus some other undergraduate degree-granting institutions. Nothing appeared to explain Table 16 results from inspection of these data, although it was thought a purely liberal arts teaching tradition would lead to less acceptance of the degree. That they perceived the roles of their teachers as very much different from the two-year colleges was very apparent, however, both from the statistically significant and insignificant results.

These attitudes of the four-year colleges have implications for equal acceptance of the D.A. among all undergraduate institutions. At the very least, it suggests that a keener awareness of the capability of D.A.'s for undergraduate teaching needs to be developed among the four-year colleges and that they somehow must not feel threatened by some imagined loss of prestige by hiring D.A.'s in their faculty mix. Eastman expresses their feelings well in his introductory remarks at Wingspread.

> "...What was at times taken to be an argument for instituting the D.A., that it would serve the community colleges (a point hotly contested by community college representatives) let others to assume that the D.A. was being downgraded: it would be good enough for community colleges but not for higher institutions" (Eastman, 1970b, p. xii).

The Carnegie Quarterly argues along with Dunham that many of the state colleges are caught up in a Harvard-Berkeley image, something we have questioned above at least about current master's schools attitudes. However, our thesis, derived from our data, that perhaps the four-year colleges may perceive the D.A. as a "junior college" degree, and consequently need to redefine their roles better in order to differentiate themselves from the latter is well stated in the following words:

> "The pity is...that the state colleges have jobs to perform that are just as important, among them educating the teachers, business men, engineers, housewives, and nurses of the nation. If the faculty of those institutions prefer as a model the highly selective liberal arts college or university whose primary job is preparing scholars for law, medicine, and the graduate schools of arts and sciences, the result is to create eighth-rate imitations of the few great research universities and to leave the fundamental job largely undone...." (Anonymous, Carnegie Quarterly, 1970, p. 2).

However, a few sentences later, the Quarterly talks about redirecting potential Ph.D. candidates into D.A. programs to open up a new market in the community colleges and help restore a balanced "ecology" in the higher educational system. Such a suggestion would not currently reassure four-year schools, we believe from our data.

Finally, as regards the levels of institutions, we come to the junior colleges. The literature is replete with references to how the D.A. might be especially valuable in the two-year schools (e.g., Wortham, 1967; McCarthy, 1969; Carnegie Quarterly, 1970; Eastman, 1970b; Anderson, 1970.) The attitudes of approval of the D.A. by the A.A.-level schools are outstanding in all our data. However, as Question 10b delineates very sharply, expressed attitudes may not necessarily be followed by action. To repeat what we said earlier, almost two in three of the two-year institutions omitted Question 10 on the right "percentage mix," a fact which we interpreted to mean that they do not currently perceive a need for either D.A.'s or Ph.D.'s. Our interpretation, we said, was especially reinforced by the many written-in opinions denying need for doctoral level teachers. This situation points up a dilemma for the emerging D.A. With a somewhat more rejecting attitude about the degree among the four-year schools (and it should be stressed here that this was <u>not</u> a denial, as all our data testify) and a lack of felt need among the junior colleges, the dilemma is well expressed by J. Boyd Page, president of the CGS, who pointed out at Wingspread that there is fair agreement that need for a D.A. exists, but we have not reached "full agreement on the 'job description' for the ultimate teaching position we expect the holders of our D.A. degree to occupy " (Page, 1970, pp. 84-85).

This need for a "job description" for the D.A. in the junior colleges particularly is most vexing to many who have pondered the problem. Eastman (1970) summarizing comments by Blocker (1970) and others at Wingspread, says the following:

> "...Perhaps the most striking aspect of the entire conference was the position taken by the community college representatives. They made it abundantly clear that they are not merely the first two years of a four year college. They are a new breed of institution, relating in new ways to the student and the community and in need of a kind of teacher that neither Ph.D. nor D.A. programs seem likely to produce, though the D.A. would come closer, particularly for supervisory posts. They have, as a major function, training in the technologies, for which present doctoral programs fail to prepare teachers. They want teachers committed to students, content to put their all into community colleges, and educated to some extent, in the history and sociology of two-year institutions. In most of these respects, the products of present graduate programs fail them. Many of the community colleges have done away with departments, substituting the larger 'divisions' therefor, and they seek staff ready to cross disciplinary

> lines and endowed with a modicum of middle-management competence: there are, they say, thousands of divisional chairman's posts waiting for the students now in graduate school or just out of it. No graduate training of the Ph.D. or D.A. variety seems to provide the middle management competence...but for breadth the D.A. may offer something, and for the commitment to teaching and for some feeling of educational history the D.A. again, in certain universities, may be of service" (Eastman, 1970b, p. xii).

It is entirely possible that the junior colleges' response indicated in Table 14 (omissions to Q. 10) also reflects their satisfaction with master's training of their teachers. Rees (1970) points out that a New York State Education Department expert charged with inspection of junior college teaching quality feels that the two-year level schools really need teachers with solid M.A.'s in arts and science rather than in education, and states that he hopes that the current discussions about the D.A. will not cause universities--especially the more prestigious who have been most guilty--to slacken their efforts to strengthen master's programs.

We must disagree with Rees and so, to some extent does McCarthy (1970), on the grounds that the current requirements for the master's degree do not allow sufficient time for coping with the current explosion in knowledge in the arts and sciences and some experience in "hands on" research, let alone for provision of the interdisciplinary breadth and preparation for and sensitivity to professional practice of best teaching strategies. Thus, for many students a new graduate degree is needed. We offer this opinion because in reply to the question on preparation for teaching (Question 9, Table 13), nine in ten respondents judged the D. A. to be better than or equal to the Ph.D. We doubt that such results would have been achieved with a contrast with the master's degree no matter with what amount of rigor it was offered, or even if the Ph.D. were contrasted with a degree such as Candidate in Philosophy, etc.

Perhaps a glimpse of what the junior colleges were <u>really</u> saying is provided in Table 6, which concerns a limited number of responses about disciplines in which the D.A. is and is not employed. The associate level schools preferred the D.A. more in the arts and sciences fields and not in the professional-technical fields as did the respondents from higher level schools. Their special concerns with these latter fields may have caused the many omissions in Question 10. Presence of D.A.'s trained in arts and sciences areas alongside master's people trained in technologies may render the latter "second class citizens." Eastman's comments about the community colleges' contentions that they are not <u>merely</u> the first two years of a four year college are very much apropros therefore.

We must turn attention now to some problems our data seem to be pointing up, not necessarily in reference to differential attitudes toward the D.A. in general among levels of institutions but to problems cutting across these levels. One of these is concerned with disciplines to be taught by the D.A. Apparently, one of the Carnegie Corporation proposal support guidelines makes no distinction between arts and sciences disciplines, but says simply, "Admissions, program administration, and the awarding of degrees are under the jurisdiction of the arts and science faculty, not the education faculty" (Dunham, 1970a). D.A.'s have been launched therefore in all arts and sciences disciplines.

The 59% of all our 151 respondents (see note to Table 6) who said "all" agreed with this approach. However, we must pay attention to the substantial minority (41%) who said "some," or essentially "none" by answering Q. 2 negatively. The 30 respondents who answered "some" to disciplines to be taught by the D.A. seemed to favor the D.A. teaching more in the humanities-social science areas than in the mathematics-natural sciences areas. This may have occurred for one or all of three reasons. (1) Perhaps it was a reflection of the "arts" aspect of "Doctor of Arts" (as distinguished, say, from a "Doctor of Science"). (2) Or it may also have reflected an awareness of the greater difficulty of execution of Ph.D.'s in the humanities-social sciences areas. Wortham (1967) cites one source which states that in English, for example, the median time it takes to get a Ph.D. is 9.7 years. Rosenhaupt (1970) reports that among the cream of Ph.D. candidates, the Woodrow Wilson fellows, the following figures obtained after six to eight years of graduate work: of 192 male science majors, 69% had obtained the Ph.D.; 44% of 183 social scientists had; and only 31% of humanists. He states that even at Princeton, which offers full support to virtually all graduate students, after six to eight years, only 50% of humanist fellows had the Ph.D. (3) Finally, the respondents may have reflected the opinion of Page (1970) that the Ph.D. should teach the sciences.

Our data may thus help cast some light on the "degree of choice" question mentioned earlier in connection with Question 3. Should the D.A. then be more a degree of choice for the humanities and social sciences? Are our respondents who are saying "some" and mentioning these disciplines more frequently in tune with Rosenhaupt's figures, whether or not they are aware of them? Maybe these respondents are reflecting some of the debate which has centered around a "degree of choice" issue or a "reform the Ph.D." issue. (Perhaps future research may show our "none" respondents in the latter camp.) The debate was in full bloom at Wingspread. Shugrue, for example, reporting at that conference after just coming from a meeting for chairmen of 35 major English departments, says:

> "...While most of that powerful group favored the reform of the Ph.D. rather than the establishment of alternative programs, such as the D.A., several, including some of the most astute and articulate chairmen present, argued for a strong endorsement of the D.A....I feel confident that the English profession is already in agreement on three points: that no new Ph.D. programs like the current ones be established in the next few years; (2) that all graduate programs be significantly modified to meet the needs of the 70's; and (3) that the D.A. be given at least a limited opportunity to prove its worth" (Shugrue, 1970, pp. 35-36).

The "reform the Ph.D." group is typified in an announcement in the May 1970 issue of Publications of the Modern Language Association to the effect that the University of Utah had introduced an alternate dissertation plan for the English Ph.D. with a focus on the Ph.D. as a scholar-teacher. The degree granted would be a Ph.D., but the whole approach is obviously that of the D.A. Also in the author's files is a letter from the head of a foreign languages department at a prominent university sent to colleagues throughout the country pleading for <u>simultaneous</u> establishment of the D.A. in several foreign languages at many major universities to forestall criticism that "University X was offering a 'cheap' doctorate."

Smith, a physicist, also at Wingspread delivered a paper entitled, "An Argument for Calling the Teaching Doctorate a Ph.D." (Smith, 1970). He described his own graduate experience working for a Ph.D. in experimental physics as tantamount to D.A. training, and stated that he believed that the distinction between applied and experimental physicists and mathematicians may almost be that between the D.A. and the Ph.D. A conference on the graduate preparation of scientists for undergraduate teaching talked about "the revised Ph.D. in the sciences" which is essentially a D.A. type of degree and which is being awarded in mathematics by the University of Wisconsin. Also mentioned at that conference was a revised Ph.D. in the sciences, but stressing teaching preparation at the University of California at Berkeley (Conference Report. AAC and CGS).

Another of our findings which turned out to be quite surprising, was the overwhelming majority (85.3% for practically all our respondents, with percentages ranging from 74.2% for four-year schools to 94.8% for associate level schools) who stated that they did not believe the Ph.D. dissertation in its present form was a necessary qualification for undergraduate college teaching. As we stated before, we did not think question format was the relevant issue. As noted above, institutions such as Berkeley, Utah, and Wisconsin, among others, have joined the "reform the Ph.D." camp--to a great degree by changing the nature of the dissertation. This activity on the part of major universities supports our contention that our answers to Question 5 were for the most part valid.

The whole problem of the dissertation has been better stated by Bowers than by anyone else, in our opinion, and may give the answer to why over eight in ten of our respondents answered the question the way they did. He says:

> "On the other hand, if we talk about preparation for undergraduate teaching in the colleges, we should emphasize much more strongly the preparation and study years required by the doctorate before the research dissertation is begun. Given the usual dissertation subject, it is hard to argue that the writing of the dissertation prepares a student in any material way to be a superior undergraduate teacher. The proof is in the eating, as usual. How many nationally recognized research scholars are teaching in colleges? The almost invariable history of the undergraduate teacher is that he reads, he ruminates, he teaches (more often effectively than not), he enjoys life one hopes, but he does not do much active research that ends in publication. The research focus of the latter part of the doctorate, therefore, is of no use to him in later life, on the evidence. The dissertation theoretically trains all our young teachers to be research scholars, but the facts are that only a very, very few ever justify the research, or final accomplishment, part of the degree by the continuous publication of fresh independent research after their doctorate. This is the basic anomaly at the root of our Ph.D. system. This is the worm in the core of the absurd situation that an originally conceived pure research degree is now the standard requirement for undergraduate teaching, a function for which its research emphasis is if not almost useless, at least ill-adjusted.
>
> "On the record, the dissertation is the major stumbling block to the award of the doctorate. The inability to complete this dissertation accounts for most of the academic failures in this country and for much of the sterility in teaching influenced by this requirement--thousands

> of man-hours of application that could have been devoted to more culturally productive ends. The dissertation training, then does not produce sufficient scholarship to justify its requirement for the vast majority of those who receive their doctorates and enter college as opposed to university teaching. If so, are there arguments in favor of the dissertation as justifying itself, nevertheless, in training superior undergraduate teachers? I must say I have never heard an argument that was convincing to me, when put up against the time and money expended on completing this formulary research part of the Ph.D. In my own view, for the usual undergraduate teaching a good man is just as good when he has passed only the preparation, or the general critical part of the Ph.D. program, and the first accomplishment stage that tests this work; that is, the rigorous learning process of the graduate courses and the private reading necessary for the batteries of preliminary doctoral examinations. All the dissertation degree candidate has is a few more years of living and of experience before he starts his classes in college, plus the extra dogged-does-it " (Bowers, 1965, p. 126).

Comment needs to be made now about Question 7, in which our respondents collectively stated that of their "typical faculty members," 72% would perceive the D.A. as inferior to the Ph.D. in prestige (Table 10). This, of course, is not unexpected, and portrays effectively where opposition to the D.A. will come from. Since perhaps the main difference between D.A. and Ph.D. is research performance of the latter in the dissertation, the kind of research and potential research productivity become the criterion for prestige.

But study after study indicates very low research productivity after attainment of the Ph.D., as Bowers states. We shall cite but one because it involves (a) one of the most prestigious institutions not only in this country, but in the world, (b) a long-term follow-up of doctoral alumni for 30 years, and (c) a field in which research has been heavily supported during much of that period. Morse and Koster (1961) report on achievements of physics graduates of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology since 1930--the report includes both Ph.D.'s and Sc.D.'s but makes no distinction between them, describing their training as exactly the same, the award of whichever degree being the student's choice. Morse and Koster give counts of published physics papers abstracted in Science Abstracts for these individuals. Working from their data we calculated that the output for MIT alumni from 1935 to 1954 in terms of published papers averaged 0.5 per man per year in the first five-year period after the degree; from 1935 to 1949, the mean was exactly the same for the first ten-year period after the degree. The 1955-59 group had a mean of 1.7 up to 1960 (incomplete data).

The truth about most Ph.D.'s, then, is that somehow post-doctoral research productivity is practically nonexistent. But if this is so, then the "prestige" is but a mirage. When asked in Question 8, why (either in Questions 6 or 7) the D.A. would be perceived as "less than Ph.D."--and since the "less than" was checked far more often in Q. 7 (faculty) then in Q. 6 (administrator-respondent)--very often comments appeared about faculty such as "faculty resentment," "faculty are a peculiar breed," "typical human reaction of those who hold the Ph.D.," etc.

The reactions we received are remarkably in tune with comments by Heiss:

> "The transcendent changes in the world of ideas render traditional methods of programming graduate education inadequate and unsuited for present demands, much less those of the future. If McLuhan's thesis is correct that individuals perceive the preceding environment to be the present, planning at best represents a lag. Faculty who plan graduate programs appear to be especially afflicted with this form of retrogressive vision. Many who severely criticized the requirements and practices in their own Ph.D. programs as outmoded and unrealistic, appear strangely incapable of suggesting modifications or designing imaginative new patterns when they are charged with planning graduate study. Berelson's observation that 'more than in any other profession...present practices are perpetuated precisely because the judges of the product are themselves producers' suggests that a closed system is in operation. Howard Mumford Jones credits William James with having said that 'no priesthood ever originates its own reforms' " (Heiss, 1968, p. 2).

Finally, we come to Question 9 (Table 13). Here we had stated earlier that whatever negativism towards the D.A. existed, it was not because respondents thought that it would not do the job of preparation for undergraduate teaching. As we look across levels of schools in Table 13, there is very little variation in the percentages (52.0% to 60.0%) of respondents rating it as better than the Ph.D. Also there is slight variation in those rating it about the same (31.0% to 40.0%); in all, 86.2% to 98.2% of respondents across schools rate it equal to or better than the Ph.D., the total for all respondents being 90.6%. Understanding of its purpose--preparation for teaching undergraduates--is then very clear. But when we examine this overall response to Question 9, with nine in ten rating it so well, and compare the responses with other questions given in the first paragraph of this discussion of results, we have proof positive of what many have contended--preparation for (and later devotion to) undergraduate teaching takes very much a second place in the world of academe. Particularly ironic is the attitude of the four-year colleges, to whom this should be a prime consideration.

The ambiguity of thinking resulting in the answers to Questions 5, 7, and 9 is nicely summed up by Epperson when he offers his critique of belief systems in the faculty culture--belief systems which have widespread acceptance among graduate faculties and university departments. One of these strongly held beliefs is that:

> "Scholars must develop extensive research competencies before they can be relied upon to serve as qualified transmitters of the discipline's culture. An individual who has not demonstrated the thoroughness and tenacity to complete a significant piece of scholarly research cannot be trusted as a purveyor of the culture of the guild. There are qualities acquired in the discipline of research that make a person more effective in his teaching role " (Epperson, 1970, p. 3).

To sum up the general tenor of our findings, we might say that collectively, among the administrative officers of the institutions contacted the reactions to the Doctor of Arts degree are favorable, varying, of course, from level to level of institution and from question to question about the D.A. The very long-term tradition of Ph.D. training for college teaching may be rather difficult to change, but we feel that our data show there is a strong sense of need for change, demonstrated not only in the great degree of response to the basic questionnaire itself but also in the positive answers to a majority of the questions. The fact that this study was done in the Southwestern area of the United States should also be considered since the number of highly prestigious universities and colleges in that region is rather limited. We have no Big Tens, no Ivy Leagues, not even a little Ivy League. Further research in other areas of the country is definitely in order.

SUMMARY

Questionnaires on attitudes towards the Doctor of Arts were sent to 187 accredited institutions in the Southwest, with useable replies received from 81%. There was a majority of favorable responses to questions concerning approval of the degree, willingness to hire, pay, and promote D.A. holders on an equal basis with Ph.D. degree holders; allowing D.A.'s to teach all disciplines at all four undergraduate year levels; adequacy of preparation for undergraduate teaching; and administrator perceived prestige. Four out of five respondents felt that the currently conceived Ph.D. dissertation was not a sine qua non for undergraduate teaching. Only in faculty-perceived prestige did the D.A. fall considerably below the Ph.D.

There were significant differences, however, among various levels of institutions in their attitudes. Generally speaking, the doctoral institutions were least favorable, the bachelor's schools next, the master's-specialist's schools third, and the two-year colleges most favorable in their attitudes. In several instances, there were statistically significant differences in attitudes between the two graduate level institutions, and even sharper differences between the two undergraduate level institutions. Receptivity among the junior colleges may be marred by the lack of perceived need for any doctorate level teachers, D.A. or Ph.D., among a majority of them at this time.

REFERENCES

Anderson, Wallace, L. Attitudes about the D.A. in Iowa. In Eastman, Arthur M. (ed.). Proceedings of the Wingspread Conference, CGS, 1970.

Anonymous. The Doctor of Arts: A high degree of teaching competence. Carnegie Quarterly, 18, Winter/Spring 1970, p. 2.

Blocker, Clyde E. The needs of the community college. In Eastman, Arthur M. (ed.). Proceedings of the Wingspread Conference, CGS, 1970.

Bowers, Fredson. Doctor of Arts: A new graduate degree. College English, 1965, 27, 123-128.

Cardozier, V. R. The Doctor of Arts Degree. Journal of Higher Education, 1968, 39, 261-270.

Conference Report on the Graduate Preparation of Scientists for Undergraduate Teaching in Liberal Arts Colleges and Universities, Washington, D. C.: Association of American Colleges and Council of Graduate Schools, 1970.

Council of Graduate Schools in the United States. The Doctor of Arts Degree. Washington, D. C.: CGS, 1970.

Eastman, Arthur M. Introduction. In Eastman, Arthur M. (ed.). Proceedings of the Wingspread Conference, CGS, 1970b, pp. ix - xiv.

Eastman, Arthur M. (ed.). Proceedings of the Wingspread Conference on the Doctor of Arts degree. Washington, D. C.: Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, 1970a.

Edwards, Allen L. Statistical Methods. (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1967.

Epperson, David C. The development-oriented scholar: recruitment, training, and renewal. Evanston: Northwestern University. Working Paper, April 8, 1970 (mimeographed).

Dunham, E. Alden. Suggestions for Doctor of Arts programs. Guidelines for submission of proposals to Carnegie Corporation of New York. New York: Carnegie Corporation, 1970a (mimeographed).

Dunham, E. Alden. Rx for higher education: the Doctor of Arts degree. Journal of Higher Education. 1970b, 41, 505-515.

Page, J. Boyd. The Council of Graduate Schools and the D. A. In Eastman, Arthur M. (ed.). Proceedings of the Wingspread Conference, CGS, 1970.

Heiss, Ann. Graduate education today: an instrument for change? Journal of Higher Education, 1968, 39, 1-10.

McCarthy, Joseph L. Preparation of undergraduate and community college teachers, Graduate School Memorandum No. 27, University of Washington, July 1969.

REFERENCES (Continued)

McCarthy, Joseph L. Quality control for the new doctorate. In Eastman, Arthur M. (ed.). Proceedings of the Wingspread Conference, CGS, 1970.

Morse, Philip M. and Koster, G. F. M.I.T. physics graduate alumni: graduate record vs. achievements. Physics Today, 1961, 14, 20-29.

Norman, Ralph D. Some problems related to the mail questionnaire technique. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1946, 8, 235-247.

Rosenhaupt, Hans. Graduate deans and the humanities. Graduate Deans' Conference, Brainerd, Minn., August 18, 1970.

Rees, Mina. Perspectives. Proceedings of the Western Association of Graduate Schools. Seattle, Washington, March 1-3, 1970, pp. 20-21.

Smith, Thomas. An argument for calling the teaching doctorate a Ph.D. In Eastman, Arthur M. (ed.). Proceedings of the Wingspread Conference, CGS, 1970.

Shugrue, Michael. The job market in English and the D. A. In Eastman, Arthur M. (ed.). Proceedings of the Wingspread Conference. CGS, 1970.

Wortham, Mary. The case for a Doctor of Arts degree: A view from junior college faculty. AAUP Bulletin, 1967, 53, 372-377.

Pittman, Joseph A. Attitudes about the D. A. in Black institutions. In Eastman, Arthur M. (ed.). Proceedings of the Wingspread Conference, CGS, 1970.

APPENDIX A

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Date_____

Dear President _____:

There has been considerable discussion about the new Doctor of Arts degree which is oriented to college teaching rather than research, and which has been approved by the Council of Graduate Schools.

I am engaged in preliminary explorations concerning the need for this degree in our area. Enclosed are brief facts about the degree, especially comparisons with the Ph.D. After reading these and adding your judgment concerning your institutional, state, and community needs, would you please answer the enclosed brief questionnaire?

If you want more information about the D.A., I would be happy to send it to you if you so indicate on the questionnaire--also, results of this study when completed.

Your reaction will be helpful in our thinking. Please return the questionnaire in the enclosed envelope. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Ralph D. Norman
Associate Dean

APPENDIX B

THE DOCTOR OF ARTS DEGREE [1]

1. Basic Rationale for the Degree

a. Many individuals believe that preparation of the college teacher falls far short of what is necessary and desirable. The problem has both qualitative and quantitative aspects. From the qualitative side, the following may be said:

(1) The kind of preparation is somehow seriously lacking. Generally speaking, graduate schools do well in preparing Ph.D.'s highly trained in research, but too narrowly specialized. The imprint of this training often extends into their undergraduate teaching in terms of subject matter presentation and attitude toward it. Much current literature on liberal arts teaching indicates that education points toward training undergraduate students for graduate careers. Graduate education fails to turn out a type of "generalist" who will be better able to relate to undergraduate needs. In an era of student unrest, this may be of more vital importance than previously, especially with greater student demands for relevance and voice ;in curriculum decision-making. The key point is that Ph.D. training is such that graduate students are trained almost exclusively along lines different from those they will really follow as college teachers.

(2) In many areas of the country, there has been a basic shift in the student pattern of college attendance, i.e., in the kinds of students and the areas and backgrounds from which they come. Many more students come or are being actively sought from minority groups. There has also been a tremendous growth of urban-commuter institutions, branch campuses, university colleges, junior colleges, etc. This pattern inevitably requires greater attention to the matter of teaching, since preparation for advanced work, for example, is probably not the goal of many of these students. Also, a much wider range of teaching strategies may be needed to instruct such students who have different needs and purposes from those we have served in the past.

b. Quantitatively, the sheer numbers of students pressing for admission to all types of institutions, and especially the growth of the junior college movement, have focused attention on the fact that the demands for researchers in many disciplines does not justify the number produced when compared with the demand for teachers. (Community colleges and four-year state colleges already enroll over 50% of all undergraduate students.) While it is recognized that the argument is often made that research enhances teaching (perhaps more than the reverse), and that there should really be no dichotomy between the two, the hard, cold facts from a number of studies show that most college teachers do little, if any, research. Also, most college teaching of any type is done at the undergraduate level.

c. The whole question of teaching vs. research is not resolved by changing the nature of the Ph.D., but in structuring a doctoral program aimed specifically to meet teaching needs. It would then become necessary to designate such a program accordingly, i.e., with culmination in a Doctor of Arts (D.A.) degree. Basic differences between the Ph.D. and D.A. are spelled out in the next section.

---

[1] Prepared, with aid of auxiliary sources, by Ralph D. Norman, Ph.D., Associate Dean, College of Arts and Sciences, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico, 87106. This is in no way an official document of the University.

2. Differences in Preparation Between the D.A. and the Ph.D.

Doctor of Arts	Doctor of Philosophy
(1) Emphasis in graduate education is that of greater breadth.	(1) Emphasis in graduate education is that of greater depth.
(2) More course work, in greater variety, in own discipline, but also inter-disciplinary study; stress on inter-relationships or integration of disciplines. (Perhaps 75-90 hours or so, apportioned between course work and research.)**	(2) Less course work as such with stress on specialization, largely in one branch of own discipline. Auxiliary courses aimed toward the specialty. (Perhaps 48 hours as minimum in course work with remainder credited to dissertation.)**
(3) Course work should include techniques of college teaching, educational' psychology and sociology; study of student personnel problems; etc. More attention to problems of "affective learning".	(3) Such course work is not stressed or given. More attention to "cognitive learning".
(4) Research experience oriented toward learning; dissertation, original work but not necessarily to produce new knowledge. Thesis required because only through personal research experience can candidate learn about and appreciate research and understand quality of evidence.	(4) Research experience oriented strongly toward practice of research techniques with much emphasis on problem solving. Must produce new knowledge. Research experience stressed throughout training.
(5) Works only on research problems which it is anticipated could be completed within a designated period of time, e.g., within 1 year on half-time basis or less.	(5) Completion time of research largely dictated by nature of problem, although not indefinite. (Past experience shows only 17% of Ph.D.'s complete dissertations in less than 1 yr.; 46% require 2 or more yrs. to complete.)
(6) Internship of about 1 yr. in college teaching (with supervision and evaluation) required. Should not be met by usual teaching assistant-ships.	(6) Internship in research. Length may be indeterminate.
(7) Foreign language requirement and/or other appropriate research tool. (Foreign language requirement may itself be optional. Carnegie Mellon University, a D.A. pioneer, has dropped it.)	(7) Foreign language requirement and/or appropriate research tool.
(8) Comprehensive examinations typically broader, but no less demanding than Ph.D.	(8) Comprehensive exams somewhat narrower, with greater stress on specialized area.

(9) Highly developed support facilities such as large specialized research libraries, extensive computer and laboratory equipment, etc., not visualized as absolutely necessary in preparation.	(9) Research emphasis would call for these facilities to be present to turn out competent Ph.D.'s.
(10) In economic terms, net cost of training would be less to both the student and institution.	(10) Net cost inevitably greater to both student and institution.

** Both degrees visualized as taking no longer than 4 academic years to complete. The Council of Graduate Schools, in its official statement on the D.A., mentions "at least three years of graduate study." The Carnegie Corporation, a leader in promoting the degree with financial support, says, "no longer than 4 years in length beyond the bachelor's degree, preferably 3 years for most full-time students."

3. Nature of the Thesis Requirement for the Doctor of Arts

The thesis required would vary from discipline to discipline. In some there might be restudy of recently done research. In social sciences, for example, there might be a reevaluation of problems studied in a different time or social setting. Synthesis of research, using secondary sources, might offer dissertation topics in almost any field, especially in the natural sciences. There need not be great reliance on usage of original data, such as is required for the Ph.D. thesis. For the D.A. dissertation, a research project related to advancement of teaching--development of curriculum materials, evaluation of teaching strategies, etc.--might be acceptable. Some D.A. dissertations might be historical, analytic, or expository, as well the usual critical study of some phase of a field which is more like the Ph.D. dissertation.

Whereas a dissertation in the usual sense is frequently mentioned, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities talks about "scholarly investigation and writing" which may include not only a dissertation, but a "creative project, or a series of scholarly papers worthy of publication."

APPENDIX C

BRIEF QUESTIONNAIRE ON DOCTOR OF ARTS DEGREE

1. Do you approve of the D. A. degree? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ D.K.
2. Would you be willing to hire, pay, and promote D. A. degree holders on an equal basis with Ph.D. degree holders? (If answer is No, please skip next 2 questions.) ☐ Yes ☐ No
3. Would you see a D. A. employed in what disciplines? ☐ All ☐ Some

   (If answer is "Some" please state which ones Yes and which ones No: Disciplines employing D. A. _____

   _____

   Disciplines not employing D. A. _____

   _____

   _____

4. If employed, do you visualize a D. A. teaching at which levels?

   ☐ Freshman only
   ☐ Lower div. (Fresh. & Soph. only)
   ☐ First 3 years only
   ☐ All 4 years

5. Some think the Ph.D. degree frequently doesn't fulfill the claim that the dissertation must contain a really original contribution to knowledge. In some fields Ph.D. dissertations are difficult to execute because of this demand. In your opinion, is a Ph.D. dissertation in its present form a necessary qualification for training an undergraduate college teacher? (Check one)

   ☐ Not at all ☐ Probably not ☐ Undecided ☐ Probably yes ☐ Very much so

6. In terms of prestige, how do you personally perceive the D. A. degree?

   ☐ higher than Ph.D.
   ☐ about the same as Ph.D.
   ☐ less than Ph.D.

7. In terms of prestige, how do you suppose your present typical faculty member would perceive the D. A. degree?

   ☐ higher than Ph.D.
   ☐ about the same as Ph.D.
   ☐ less than Ph.D.

8. If in either No. 6 or No. 7 above you checked "less than Ph.D." please state why. _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

(Continued on Page 2)

9. How do you perceive the training of a D. A. for undergraduate college teaching as compared with Ph.D.?

- ☐ better than Ph.D.
- ☐ about the same as Ph.D.
- ☐ worse than Ph.D.

10. If you feel that <u>all</u> college teachers should have a doctorate and that there is room for both D. A.'s and Ph.D.'s, what do you conceive to be about the right percentage mix of faculty with each degree in your institution?

☐ % D. A.'s plus ☐ % of Ph.D.'s = 100%

11. Check your type of institution:

<u>Degree Level</u>

- ☐ Doctor's degree granting
- ☐ M.A. or Specialist degree granting
- ☐ 4-year liberal arts college only
- ☐ 4-year liberal arts and other degree programs
- ☐ 2-year institution
- ☐ Other (describe) _____

<u>Type</u>

- ☐ Private
- ☐ Public

12. How many students are enrolled in your institution?

_____ Number
_____ Full-time Equivalents (FTE)

13. I would like to receive further information from you about the relative merits of the D. A. degree.

☐ Yes ☐ No

NAME _____

TITLE _____

INSTITUTION _____

Please return to Dr. Ralph D. Norman, Associate Dean, A & S College, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, N. M., 87106, in enclosed self-addressed envelope.